

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-3 are currently pending. In the instant Office Action, the Examiner has raised a single rejection:

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wireman (U.S. Patent No. 4,737,776), in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,465).

Applicant has amended the abstract to correct a typographical error by deletion of a duplicated phrase. In addition, Applicant hereby adds new Claims 4-8, in order to further the prosecution of the present application and Applicant's business interests, yet without acquiescing to the Examiner's arguments. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the original, similar, or broader claims in one or more future application(s). The amendment and new claims do not introduce new matter and are not intended to narrow the scope of any of the claims within the meaning of *Festo*.¹

The Claims Are Unobvious Over Wireman in View of Wang

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over Wireman (U.S. Patent No. 4,737,776), in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,465). The Examiner states:

"[i]n reference to claims 1, 3, Wireman discloses the claimed cable comprising two conductors, and circuitry associated with the conductors for providing current to the event sensor and detecting changes in the current to indicate tampering at the sensor, severing of the cable and/or an event detected by the sensor, which is met by a system and circuit for activating an alarm of a burglar detection; the system comprising a pair of insulated monitor wires 26 and 28 having a current limiting resistor 30, service line 16 with wires 18 and 20 connected to a telephone 33, and wires 36 or 38 and either or both of wires 26 and 28, the telephone service stops and the first loop 24 is opened, activating alarm 34. Also, current ceases (becoming "low current") to be supplied to the relay 40, resulting in the closing of the contacts 44 (col. 3, lines 4-13; col. 4, lines 50-62). *Although Wireman does not specifically disclose the claimed cable being between and alarm panel and an event sensor, he does disclose that the system and circuit is used for activating an alarm of a burglar detection system.* Wang discloses backup arrangement for an alarm system including an alarm control panel 20 with a plurality of wires connected to the panel 20; the voltage of the system is monitored and interruption can be

¹ *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 535 U.S. 722, 122 S.Ct. 1831, 1838, 62 USPQ2d 1705, 1710 (2002).

detected once any of the wires are cut, the backup power arrangement will continue to energize the system (col. 5, lines 38-62). Since Wireman discloses that the cable containing the six wires can be used with a burglar detection system, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of placing a cable between an alarm panel and an event sensor as disclosed by Wang, with the system of Wireman, to ensure that tampering of the cable will be detected at the location of the control panel, where many burglars will attempt to cut wires and disarm the system.

In reference to claim 2, Wireman discloses the claimed two conductor cable extending and providing a short six-conductor cable for connection, which is met by wires 18 and 20, conventionally in a two wire system, such that the service line 16 is routed through interior partitions and terminates in "plugs" or "connectors" which service individual telephones. The system comprising a pair of insulated monitor wires 26 and 28 having a current limiting resistor 30, service line 16 with wires 18 and 20 connected to a telephone 33, and wires 36 and 38 connected to DC voltage source 42 (col. 3, lines 4-13; col. 4, lines 50-62). *Although Wireman does not specifically disclose the claimed cable being between an alarm panel and an event sensor, he does disclose that the system and circuit is used for activating an alarm of a burglar detection system.* Wang discloses backup arrangement for an alarm system including an alarm control panel 20 with a plurality of wires connected to the panel 20; the voltage of the system is monitored and interruption can be detected once any of the wires are cut, the backup power arrangement will continue to energize the system (col. 5, lines 38-62). Since Wireman discloses that the cable containing the six wires can be used with a burglar alarm system, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of placing a cable between an alarm panel and an event sensor, as disclosed by Wang, with the system of Wireman, to ensure that tampering of the cable will be detected at the location of the control panel, where many burglars will attempt to cut wires and disarm the system" (Office Action, pages 2-4).

Applicant must respectfully disagree. Nonetheless, Applicant has added new Claims 4-8, in order to further the prosecution of the present application and Applicant's business interests, yet without acquiescing to the Examiner's arguments, and while reserving the right to prosecute the original, similar, or broader Claims in one or more future application(s).

Specifically, Applicant has added new dependent Claim 4 which recites "wherein said event sensor is a passive infra-red detector." Support for the new claim is found in the Specification as filed, which discloses that "[i]t is an object of the present invention to reduce the number of conductors between an alarm control panel and an event sensor such as a PIR" (Specification, at page 1, lines 24-26). In addition Applicant has added new independent Claim 5 which recites an "alarm system comprising a cable between an alarm panel and an

event sensor, the cable **consisting of two conductors**, and circuitry associated with said conductors." Support for this amendment is found in the abstract which discloses "[w]iring costs are reduced in the present invention by providing only two conductors which work to provide all of the functions of a six-conductor cable" (Specification, at page 9, lines 13-15). Lastly, new Claims 6-8 which depend upon Claim 5, correspond to Claims 2-4 which depend upon Claim 1.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires among other conditions, a teaching or suggestion of all claim limitations (MPEP, 2143). Applicant asserts that all of the claim limitations are neither taught nor suggested by the Wireman/Wang combination. The Examiner is reminded that Claims 1-4 are directed to an "alarm system comprising a cable between an alarm panel and an **event sensor**." In contrast, Wireman discloses a "closed loop circuit 24 connected to a normally closed or supervisory circuit of the alarm 34 of the burglar detection system" ('776, sentence bridging columns 3 and 4). Secondly, Wang discloses a "backup arrangement 10 incorporated between a burglary or fire alarm control panel 20 and a system warning alarm 30 of a burglary or fire alarm system. . . The **system warning device 30** is an audible and/or visible warning device which may consist of siren, bell horn, buzzer, chime, sounder, speaker (with driver), strobe light, warning light, or warning lamp" ('465, at column 3, lines 27-46). At best the Wireman/Wang combination would provide a cable between an alarm panel and a system warning device. As characterized by Wang, the **system warning device** (audible and/or visible signal) is clearly distinct from Applicant's **event sensor** which is described as a passive infrared detector or motion detector (Specification, at page 9, lines 7 and 8). Thus, the Wireman/Wang combination fails to provide an alarm system comprising a cable between an alarm panel and an event sensor.

In addition, Claims 5-8 require a "cable **consisting of two conductors**, and circuitry associated with said conductors for providing current to the **event sensor** and detecting changes in said current to indicate tampering at the sensor, severing of the cable and/or an event detected by the sensor." In contrast, as characterized by the Examiner, Wireman discloses a "system comprising a pair of insulated monitor **wires 26 and 28** having a current limiting resistor 30, service line 16 with **wires 18 and 20** connected to a telephone 33, and **wires 36 and 38** connected to DC voltage source 42. . .[while] Wang discloses backup arrangement for an alarm system including an alarm control panel 20 with a **plurality of**

wires connected to the panel" (Office Action, page 2). In short, the Wireman/Wang combination differs from the claimed invention with respect to the number of conductors employed, as well as an event sensor.

Furthermore, Claims 3 and 7 require that "an event detection by the sensor provides a **medium current state**." In contrast, neither Wireman nor Wang disclose alarm systems producing a medium current state upon the triggering of an event detector. Similarly, Claims 4 and 8 require that the "event sensor is a **passive infra-red detector**." Again, neither Wireman nor Wang disclose alarms systems comprising a passive infra-red detector.

As a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. However, should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would aid in the prosecution of this application, Applicant encourages the Examiner to call the undersigned collect.

Dated: September 12, 2003



Christine A. Lekutis
Registration No. 51,934

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP
101 Howard Street, Suite 350
San Francisco, California 94105
415.904.6500